DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 135 JC 900 125

TITLE	Defining and Promoting Transfer from Community Colleges. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	15 Mar 90
NOTE	23p.; Nine pages of charts in light dot matrix type.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Credits; *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; Definitions; *Enrollment Rate; *Enrollment Trends; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In this study an effort was made to stablize definitions of transfer rates and to publicize feasible ways of collecting usable data by conducting a Transfer Assembly. After an advisory panel established a preliminary equation for calculating transfer rates, 235 community colleges with high Hispanic, Black, and American Indian enrollments were asked to provide data on "students who entered the community college in fall 1984 with no prior college experience and who within five years completed at least 12 college credits at the college and subsequently took at least one class at a four-year college or university." By March 1990, 39 colleges had supplied usable data concerning the course-taking and transfer experiences of the students who entered in fall 1984. In all cases, data were generated from at least two sources, the college's own records and the students listed in university or staff office files. The data revealed that: (1) 17% of the entering students had received 12-23 units at the community college, and 37% had received 24 or more units; (2) 14% of those receiving 12-23 units and 25% of those receiving 24 or more units had transferred; (3) the overall transfer rate was 22%. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315135

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1749 MANDEVILLE LANE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90049
(213) 208-6088

DEFINING AND PROMOTING TRANSFER FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Interim Report to the Ford Foundation

March 15, 1990

Grant No. 890-0911

JC900125

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. M. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE TRANSFER ASSEMBLY

The community colleges have always provided certain basic services: open access to anyone seeking job entry skills, collegiate studies bearing credit toward the bachelor's degree, basic language and literacy preparation, and educative activities to satisfy a personal interest. The emphasis placed on one or another of these functions has shifted over time and in different locales because of student interests and abilities, state policies and funding priorities, and patterns of institutional leadership. But all the services have remained intact and most colleges pursue them all with greater or lesser vigor.

Are the colleges doing a good job? No satisfactory answer can be given to that deceptively simple question. Attempts to generate a plausible response stumble on issues of special-group politics, philosophies of education, theories of human development, desired societal directions, and all other subordinate areas of interpretation. Are the colleges good relative to what? Good for which of their multiple constituencies? Good in which of their service components?

The answers to questions of worth can only be pieced together by viewing the findings of single-dimension studies. Each researcher selects a separate institutional function or identifiable group to be served and seeks information pertaining to that limited context: How many people who would otherwise have been excluded from participation in college were enabled to

attend? How many were assisted toward the baccalaureate? How many obtained jobs in the field for which they were prepared? What have the colleges done for the economic or cultural well-being of their community?

These undimensional studies have strengths: they are feasible to do; they can guide the formation of policies affecting the institutions; and, taken together, they provide a view of the colleges that cannot be readily obtained in any other way. They have weaknesses as well: their methodologies preclude consideration of all relevant dimensions (the variables that are chosen to study exclude all others by definition); and if more than a few variables are included, the result is a useless melange. For example, because institutional policy is to admit all students, little value can be derived from studies demonstrating that younger students of higher ability and SES who plan on transfer are more likely to do so than are older, lower ability, low SES students who have other goals. And loading in additional variables such as the courses the students took or the instructors who taught them, yields no potential for practice; rules governing the formation of curriculum and the conduct of instructors are rarely influenced by assessing outcomes for which the casual relationships are tenuous at best.

Still, various constituency groups and legislators want information. The community college is a large visible enterprise enrolling nearly half of all students who begin college in America, and over one-third of the matriculants list transfer as their primary reason for attending. To tabulate transfer rates is not to deny the importance of the colleges' other functions. It is

to say to the public, "Your children's academic aspirations will not be set back if they attend our college." It is to offer a response to the critics who, in the absence of valid data, rely on their prejudices to deny the community colleges' importance in furthering student progress. It is to help a professional group to be aware of its effects.

TRANSFER

Transfer rates have been reported from time to time, but no valid conclusions can be drawn because the data are too sparse, and the definitions of transfer are not consistent. Few colleges maintain data on the number of their students who transfer. Many college leaders fear the untoward comparisons that are often made between the progress of their students and those who begin as freshmen in the selective four-year institutions. Furthermore, the colleges receive funding based on the number of students who take classes, not on the number who complete programs or go on to further education; hence, there are no incentives to organize and fund systems to produce the data.

The definitions of transfer are not stable. Is a high school graduate who takes a summer class at the community college before matriculating as a university freshman in the fall a transfer? Is a university underclassman who takes classes at a local community college from time to time a transfer? How many units must a community college student complete before matriculating at a university to be called a transfer? How should those

students who stop out of the education system for a few years before transferring be counted? If the universities accepted as transfers only those students who had completed associate degree requirements, the definitional question would be at least partially resolved. But the issue of what to use as the denominator in calculating a transfer rate would remain open.

The inconsistent definitions give rise to incredibly diverse conclusions. Flaherty (1989) reported a transfer rate of less than 12 percent for the colleges in Illinois at the same time that the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges (1989) found a transfer rate exceeding 42 percent for the California colleges. Are the two systems that disparate? Of course not. Each reporter used a different mode of calculation. Flaherty divided the number of students transferring to an Illinois college or university in 1988 by the total enrollment in "pre-baccalaureate programs" during the previous fall. The Chancellor's Office divided the number transferring in 1988-89 by the "number of California high school graduates who entered community colleges three years prior to transfer" (p.12). Single-college studies yield even more variant findings: By dividing the number of transfers by the number of sophomores enrolled during the prior year, Heinselman (1985) found one California college with a 97 percent transfer rate, another with a rate of less than one percent.

Elsewhere, other ways of estimating transfer rates have been made. One approach has been to conduct a survey or analyze the transcripts of the students who receive bachelor's degrees. The Washington State Board for Community Colleges (1989) surveyed a

sample of bachelors degree recipients and found that 48 percent had transferred credits from a Washington community college. The National Center for Education Statistics analyzed the transcripts of the students who had participated in the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. By tracking those students through their peripatetic postsecondary experiences NCES estimated that 20 percent of those receiving bachelor's degrees had attended a community college at some time (Adelman, 1987). Berman and Weiler (1989) surveyed the students who had been enrolled in 28 colleges in spring term, 1988, but who had not returned in the fall and found that 26 percent of those who had taken six or more credits at the community college had matriculated at a four-year college or university. Palmer (1986) listed several other single-college and statewide studies.

THE TRANSFER ASSEMBLY

What is the valid approach to defining transfer rates? Can the colleges and universities be stimulated to provide reliable data? In an attempt to stabilize the definitions and to publicize feasible ways of collecting usable data, the Ford Foundation sponsored the Transfer Assembly. The reasoning underlying the Assembly was that until we have a valid definition of transfer, and reliable data to back it up, we cannot know if the many efforts to stimulate transfer have had any effect. Anecdotal information is one way of knowing but it is insufficient to satisfy funding agents and policy makers. We must be able to

collect the data and calculate transfer rates across colleges and states and over time using a readily acceptable formula. Only then will we have a benchmark from which the results of changed state policies and institutional practices can be assessed.

The Center for the Study of Community Colleges has participated in several Ford Foundation transfer-related projects. For the Assembly, the Center convened an advisory panel to establish a preliminary equation for calculating transfer rates and solicited data from the 235 American community colleges with high Hispanic, black, and American Indian enrollments. The sample of colleges with high minority enrollments was chosen because the Foundation's efforts on behalf of transfer have centered on measuring the number of minority students who enter and progress in higher education.

Certain considerations of validity and feasibility guided the search for a formula and an approach to collecting the data. The project staff and panel recommended longitudinal analysis so that students could be tracked from community college matriculation until they entered a four-year college or university. The mode of calculation was to assess the progress of all potential transfers, including the students who had delayed college entry and those who were not certain initially that they intended transferring. It would take account of the stop in and out, part time attendance patterns that most community college entrants manifest, but would eliminate from consideration those students who had been to the senior institutions prior to community college entrance (the reverse transfers) and those who took only a course or two at the college (the occasional attenders). And the

procedure would be such that the colleges themselves could continue the student tracking after the project was over.

The agreed-on equation was "Students who entered the community college in fall, 1984, with no prior college experience and who within five years completed at least 12 college-credit units at the college and subsequently took at least one class at a four-year college or university."

The presidents of the 235 American community colleges with minority student enrollments in excess of 20 percent were asked to provide the data. Around half of them indicated that they would like to participate but not many of them had adequate information. Most had the requisite data on their own students' course-taking history but few had any knowledge of which students subsequently enrolled at a university. The project staff offered a stipend to help the colleges pay for collecting those data but that stimulated little activity. Offers to provide technical assistance proved more fruitful. Several college data compilers welcomed the Center staff's intervention with state agencies and university systems to help them retrieve the data that they needed to check against their own records. And many of them also accepted Center staff suggestions about how they might approach their major receiving institutions. However, for most, the college's ability to track students' educational careers ended at the college's exit doors.

By January, 1990, six months after the initial requests for information had been sent, 25 colleges had supplied usable data concerning the course-taking and transfer experiences of the

students who had entered in fall, 1984. In some cases the data were incomplete because the college staff had obtained transfer information from only the two or three senior institutions at which most of their transfers matriculated, or because they relied on follow up surveys to which not all students responded. Some data compilers were able to obtain student information from their state university system or higher education office. In all cases where the data were forthcoming, they had to be generated from at least two data bases: the college's own records and the students listed in university or state office files.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

By March, 1990, 39 colleges had supplied data. In those colleges:

17 percent of the entering students had received 12-23 units;

37 percent had received 24 or more units;

14 percent of those receiving 12-23 units had transferred;

25 percent of those receiving 24 or more units had transferred;

the overall transfer rate was 22 percent.

Following is a roster of participating colleges and the transfer and course unit achievement rate for each institution.

Table 1 Demographics of the 39 participating colleges

Control

Public 37	Private 2

Enrollments

Small		Medium		Large	
001-499	3	1500-2499	5	10000-14999	5
500-999	3	2500-4999	5	15000 +	8
1000-1499	1	5000-7499	7		
		7500-9999	2		

Table 2. Participating colleges by region and state

Northeast
Massachusetts
- Roxbury

New York
- New York Technical
- Borough of Manhattan
- LaGuardia
- Bronx

Middle States
Maryland
- Prince George's
- Montgomery

New Jersey
- Cumberland

Pennsylvania
- Allegheny
- Philadelphia

South
Florida
- Miami-Dade

Mississippi
- Hinds

North Carolina
- Edgecombe
- James Sprunt
- Anson
- Vance-Granville

Virginia
- Thomas Nelson

Midwest
Illinois
- St. Augustine
- City Colleges of Chicago*

Ohio
- Cuyahoga

Mountain Plains
Kansas
- Donnelly
- Kansas City

Montana
- Blackfeet

Southwest
New Mexico
- New Mexico Military
- San Juan

Texas
- Texas Southmost
- Houston
- Lee
- Alvin
- Austin
- Cedar Valley
- Mainland
- El Centro

Arizona
- South Mountain*

West
California
- Merritt
- San Francisco City
- Barstow
- Southwestern
- Alameda
- Santa Monica
- Los Medanos
- San Diego City*
- LACCD Colleges*

* Colleges in process of compiling data.

COLLEGE		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
VANCE	TOTAL	213	5	2	308	528
NC	CREDITS 12-23	44	1	1	99	145
	TRANSFERS	10	0	0	14	24
	CREDITS 24+	138	3	1	154	296
	TRANSFERS	7	0	0	10	17
CE		0.854	0.8	1	0.821	0.835
TE		0.08	0	0	0.078	0.078
TC		0.093	0	0	0.095	0.093
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
PRINCE	TOTAL	1344	61	15	1802	3222
MD	CREDITS 12-23	156	9	1	250	416
	TRANSFERS	6	6	0	83	95
	CREDITS 24+	245	19	1	556	821
	TRANSFERS	84	6	0	306	396
CE		0.298	0.459	0.133	0.447	0.384
TE		0.067	0.197	0	0.216	0.152
TC		0.224	0.429	0	0.483	0.397
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
KANSAS CITY	TOTAL	206	35	3	665	909
KS	CREDITS 12-23	33	3	0	88	124
	TRANSFERS	9	0	0	21	30
	CREDITS 24+	61	17	0	182	260
	TRANSFERS	26	6	0	87	119
CE		0.456	0.571	0	0.406	0.422
TE		0.17	0.171	0	0.162	0.164
TC		0.372	0.3		0.4	0.388
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
SPRUNT	TOTAL	97	0	3	156	256
NC	CREDITS 12-23	23	0	0	41	64
	TRANSFERS	3	0	0	5	8
	CREDITS 24+	39	0	0	76	115
	TRANSFERS	8	0	0	33	41
CE		0.639		0	0.75	0.699
TE		0.113		0	0.244	0.191
TC		0.177			0.325	0.274
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
EDGECOME	TOTAL	439	0	3	436	878
NC	CREDITS 12-23	242	0	2	221	465
	TRANSFERS	20	0	0	38	58
	CREDITS 24+	147	0	0	159	306
	TRANSFERS	16	0	0	18	34
CE		0.886		0.667	0.872	0.878
TE		0.082		0	0.128	0.105
TC		0.093		0	0.147	0.119

		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
DONNELLY	TOTAL	110	9	0	22	141
KS	CREDITS 12-23	24	0	0	7	31
	TRANSFERS	2	0	0	1	3
	CREDITS 24+	44	6	0	9	59
	TRANSFERS	22	4	0	4	30
CE		0.618	0.667		0.727	0.638
TE		0.218	0.444		0.227	0.234
TC		0.353	0.667		0.313	0.367
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
PHILADELPHIA	TOTAL	1746	282	3	1747	3778
PA	CREDITS 12-23	396	38	1	413	848
	TRANSFERS	174	16	0	169	359
	CREDITS 24+	546	58	0	642	1246
	TRANSFERS	238	25	0	287	550
CE		0.54	0.34	0.333	0.604	0.554
TE		0.236	0.145	0	0.261	0.241
TC		0.437	0.427	0	0.432	0.434
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
MONTGOMERY	TOTAL	515	172	14	2788	3489
MD	CREDITS 12-23	87	18	1	419	525
	TRANSFERS	2	1	0	38	41
	CREDITS 24+	169	75	6	989	1239
	TRANSFERS	15	6	0	172	193
CE		0.497	0.541	0.5	0.505	0.506
TE		0.033	0.041	0	0.075	0.067
TC		0.066	0.075	0	0.149	0.133
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
TX Southmost	TOTAL	3	825	3	126	957
TX	CREDITS 12-23	1	134	0	29	164
	TRANSFERS	0	1	0	3	4
	CREDITS 24+	1	498	1	32	532
	TRANSFERS	1	64	0	9	74
CE		0.667	0.766	0.333	0.484	0.727
TE		0.333	0.079	0	0.095	0.082
TC		0.5	0.103	0	0.197	0.112
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
New York Tech	TOTAL	1620	753	42	557	2972
NY	CREDITS 12-23	218	91	2	43	354
	TRANSFERS	61	29	0	21	111
	CREDITS 24+	1335	563	4	287	2189
	TRANSFERS	169	79	3	58	309
CE		0.959	0.869	0.143	0.592	0.856
TE		0.142	0.143	0.071	0.142	0.141
TC		0.148	0.165	0.5	0.239	0.165

		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
SAN JUAN	TOTAL	4	72	160	354	590
NM	CREDITS 12-23	0	16	26	59	101
	TRANSFERS	0	2	1	8	11
	CREDITS 24+	3	20	68	92	183
	TRANSFERS	0	1	6	15	22
CE		0.75	0.5	0.588	0.427	0.481
TE		0	0.042	0.044	0.065	0.056
TC		0	0.083	0.074	0.152	0.116
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
St. AUGUSTINE	TOTAL	0	262	0	0	262
IL	CREDITS 12-23	0	155	0	0	155
	TRANSFERS	0	8	0	0	8
	CREDITS 24+	0	33	0	0	33
	TRANSFERS	0	13	0	0	13
CE		####	0.718	####	####	0.718
TE		####	0.08	####	####	0.08
TC		####	0.112	####	####	0.112
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
Miami-Dade	TOTAL	714	2938	21	1352	5025
FL	CREDITS 12-23	115	453	0	216	784
	TRANSFERS	4	12	0	17	33
	CREDITS 24+	371	1802	15	764	2952
	TRANSFERS	63	510	5	238	816
CE		0.681	0.768	0.714	0.725	0.743
TE		0.094	0.178	0.238	0.189	0.169
TC		0.138	0.231	0.333	0.26	0.227
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
NM MILITARY	TOTAL	14	29	1	179	223
NM	CREDITS 12-23	6	11	1	30	48
	TRANSFERS	3	8	0	21	32
	CREDITS 24+	8	18	0	124	150
	TRANSFERS	7	15	0	117	139
CE		1	1	1	0.86	0.888
TE		0.714	0.793	0	0.771	0.767
TC		0.714	0.793	0	0.896	0.864
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
SANTA MONICA	TOTAL	309	306	29	1439	2083
CA	CREDITS 12-23	56	78	6	308	448
	TRANSFERS	2	2	1	24	29
	CREDITS 24+	107	112	12	612	843
	TRANSFERS	37	24	2	298	361
CE		0.528	0.621	0.621	0.639	0.62
TE		0.126	0.085	0.103	0.224	0.187
TC		0.239	0.137	0.167	0.35	0.302

		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
ALLEGHENY	TOTAL	551	15	17	4442	5025
PA	CREDITS 12-23	178	3	4	867	1052
	TRANSFERS	3	0	0	60	63
	CREDITS 24+	215	4	7	1953	2179
	TRANSFERS	10	0	3	667	680
CE		0.713	0.467	0.647	0.635	0.643
TE		0.024	0	0.176	0.164	0.148
TC		0.033	0	0.273	0.258	0.23
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
LOS MEDANOS	TOTAL	115	171	26	1743	2055
CA	CREDITS 12-23	13	24	3	138	178
	TRANSFERS	1	1	0	3	5
	CREDITS 24+	8	12	4	144	168
	TRANSFERS	1	2	0	20	23
CE		0.183	0.211	0.269	0.162	0.168
TE		0.017	0.018	0	0.013	0.014
TC		0.095	0.083	0	0.082	0.081
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
MANHATTAN	TOTAL	1347	716	37	357	2457
NY	CREDITS 12-23	251	133	7	66	457
	TRANSFERS	22	12	1	6	41
	CREDITS 24+	707	376	19	187	1289
	TRANSFERS	88	47	2	23	160
CE		0.711	0.711	0.703	0.709	0.711
TE		0.082	0.082	0.081	0.081	0.082
TC		0.115	0.116	0.115	0.115	0.115
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
CUYAHOGA	TOTAL	549	40	13	1471	2073
OH	CREDITS 12-23	89	6	4	252	351
	TRANSFERS	10	0	3	50	63
	CREDITS 24+	253	21	0	804	1078
	TRANSFERS	30	0	0	113	143
CE		0.623	0.675	0.308	0.718	0.689
TE		0.073	0	0.231	0.111	0.099
TC		0.117	0	0.75	0.154	0.144
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
ANSON NC	TOTAL	67	1	1	122	191
NC	CREDITS 12-23	8	0	0	27	35
	TRANSFERS	2	0	0	1	3
	CREDITS 24+	20	0	0	35	55
	TRANSFERS	4	0	0	8	12
CE		0.418	0	0	0.508	0.471
TE		0.09	0	0	0.074	0.079
TC		0.214	####	####	0.145	0.167

		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
ROXBURY	TOTAL	386	102	0	29	517
MA	CREDITS 12-23	85	9	0	5	99
	TRANSFERS	5	0	0	3	8
	CREDITS 24+	141	34	0	17	192
	TRANSFERS	70	3	0	8	84
CE		0.585	0.422	####	0.759	0.563
TE		0.194	0.059	####	0.379	0.178
TC		0.332	0.14	####	0.5	0.316
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
CUMBERLAND	TOTAL	76	45	17	490	628
NJ	CREDITS 12-23	2	1	0	16	19
	TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	0
	CREDITS 24+	23	15	4	135	177
	TRANSFERS	6	3	0	58	67
CE		0.329	0.356	0.235	0.308	0.312
TE		0.079	0.067	0	0.118	0.107
TC		0.24	0.188	0	0.384	0.342
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
THOMAS NELS	TOTAL	268	11	5	854	1138
VA	CREDITS 12-23	15	0	1	68	84
	TRANSFERS	1	0	1	6	8
	CREDITS 24+	47	5	2	214	268
	TRANSFERS	2	3	1	46	52
CE		0.231	0.455	0.6	0.33	0.309
TE		0.011	0.273	0.4	0.061	0.053
TC		0.048	0.6	0.667	0.184	0.17
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
AUSTIN	TOTAL	282	536	24	3055	3897
TX	CREDITS 12-23	41	88	3	477	609
	TRANSFERS	7	16	0	143	166
	CREDITS 24+	55	110	3	544	712
	TRANSFERS	13	36	0	242	291
CE		0.34	0.369	0.25	0.334	0.339
TE		0.071	0.097	0	0.126	0.117
TC		0.208	0.263	0	0.377	0.346
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
CEDAR VALLEY	TOTAL	236	19	2	256	513
TX	CREDITS 12-23	45	3	1	42	91
	TRANSFERS	4	0	0	5	9
	CREDITS 24+	60	5	0	81	146
	TRANSFERS	13	1	0	25	39
CE		0.445	0.421	0.5	0.48	0.462
TE		0.072	0.053	0	0.117	0.094
TC		0.162	0.125	0	0.244	0.203

		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
HINDS	TOTAL	771	2	1	1372	2146
MS	CREDITS 12-23	121	0	0	174	295
	TRANSFERS	1	0	0	8	9
	CREDITS 24+	473	1	0	810	1284
	TRANSFERS	22	0	0	179	201
CE		0.77	0.5	0	0.717	0.736
TE		0.03	0	0	0.136	0.098
TC		0.039	0	####	0.19	0.133
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
MERRITT	TOTAL	619	128	19	851	1617
CA	CREDITS 12-23	58	19	1	104	182
	TRANSFERS	0	0	0	4	4
	CREDITS 24+	133	17	5	114	269
	TRANSFERS	17	4	0	19	40
CE		0.309	0.281	0.316	0.256	0.279
TE		0.027	0.031	0	0.027	0.027
TC		0.089	0.111	0	0.106	0.098
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
BARSTOW	TOTAL	38	47	11	248	344
CA	CREDITS 12-23	5	1	1	11	18
	TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	0
	CREDITS 24+	1	5	0	11	17
	TRANSFERS	0	0	0	1	1
CE		0.158	0.128	0.091	0.089	0.102
TE		0	0	0	0.004	0.003
TC		0	0	0	0.045	0.029
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
HOUSTON	TOTAL	1024	1170	15	2735	4944
TX	CREDITS 12-23	168	216	1	394	779
	TRANSFERS	24	9	1	78	112
	CREDITS 24+	249	182	3	448	882
	TRANSFERS	38	16	1	117	172
CE		0.407	0.34	0.267	0.308	0.336
TE		0.061	0.021	0.133	0.071	0.057
TC		0.149	0.063	0.5	0.232	0.171
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
MAINLAND	TOTAL	40	33	2	259	334
TX	CREDITS 12-23	9	6	1	51	67
	TRANSFERS	1	0	0	5	6
	CREDITS 24+	15	11	1	75	102
	TRANSFERS	4	3	0	24	31
CE		0.6	0.515	1	0.486	0.506
TE		0.125	0.091	0	0.112	0.111
TC		0.208	0.176	0	0.23	0.219

		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
LAGUARDIA	TOTAL	634	614	5	236	1489
NY	CREDITS 12-23	102	102	1	25	230
	TRANSFERS	11	16	0	8	35
	CREDITS 24+	397	341	3	150	891
	TRANSFERS	42	37	0	41	120
CE		0.787	0.721	0.8	0.742	0.753
TE		0.084	0.086	0	0.208	0.104
TC		0.106	0.12	0	0.28	0.138
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
ALVIN	TOTAL	103	105	1	785	994
TX	CREDITS 12-23	18	12	0	154	184
	TRANSFERS	2	3	0	19	24
	CREDITS 24+	27	38	0	323	388
	TRANSFERS	3	8	0	120	131
CE		0.437	0.476	0	0.608	0.575
TE		0.049	0.105	0	0.177	0.156
TC		0.111	0.22	####	0.291	0.271
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
LEE	TOTAL	41	52	1	325	419
TX	CREDITS 12-23	12	12	0	62	86
	TRANSFERS	1	1	0	9	11
	CREDITS 24+	15	29	0	189	233
	TRANSFERS	4	6	0	90	100
CE		0.659	0.788	0	0.772	0.761
TE		0.122	0.135	0	0.305	0.265
TC		0.185	0.171	####	0.394	0.348
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
SF CITY	TOTAL	583	527	19	1157	2286
CA	CREDITS 12-23	70	58	1	123	252
	TRANSFERS	2	1	0	4	7
	CREDITS 24+	111	139	3	325	578
	TRANSFERS	42	26	0	144	212
CE		0.31	0.374	0.211	0.387	0.363
TE		0.075	0.051	0	0.128	0.096
TC		0.243	0.137	0	0.33	0.264
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
SOUTHWESTERN	TOTAL	148	867	13	760	1788
CA	CREDITS 12-23	22	123	4	104	253
	TRANSFERS	2	2	0	5	9
	CREDITS 24+	44	371	2	283	700
	TRANSFERS	5	97	0	78	180
CE		0.446	0.57	0.462	0.509	0.533
TE		0.047	0.114	0	0.109	0.106
TC		0.106	0.2	0	0.214	0.198

		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
EL CENTRO	TOTAL	376	77	5	170	628
TX	CREDITS 12-23	80	8	1	24	113
	TRANSFERS	11	1	0	12	24
	CREDITS 24+	96	27	0	43	166
	TRANSFERS	25	8	0	16	49
CE		0.468	0.455	0.2	0.394	0.444
TE		0.096	0.117	0	0.165	0.116
TC		0.205	0.257	0	0.418	0.262
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
ALAMEDA	TOTAL	534	107	20	581	1242
CA	CREDITS 12-23	70	17	3	91	181
	TRANSFERS	1	1	0	3	5
	CREDITS 24+	123	26	6	129	284
	TRANSFERS	9	1	1	22	33
CE		0.361	0.402	0.45	0.379	0.374
TE		0.019	0.019	0.05	0.043	0.031
TC		0.052	0.047	0.111	0.114	0.082
		B	H	AI	W	TOTAL
BLACKFEET	TOTAL	0	0	52	7	59
MT	CREDITS 12-23	0	0	5	1	6
	TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	0
	CREDITS 24+	0	0	19	1	20
	TRANSFERS	0	0	5	2	7
CE		####	####	0.462	0.286	0.441
TE		####	####	0.096	0.286	0.119
TC		####	####	0.208	1	0.269
DATA FROM 38 COLLEGES						
		BLACK	HISP	AMIND	WHITE	TOTAL
entrants		16122	11134	605	34236	62097
credits 12-23		2863	1848	83	5499	10293
transfers 12-23		407	148	8	895	1458
credits24		6427	4993	189	11693	23302
transfers 24		1141	1057	29	3715	5942
transfers total		1548	1205	37	4610	7400
CE		0.576	0.614	0.45	0.502	0.541
TE		0.096	0.108	0.061	0.135	0.119
TC		0.167	0.176	0.136	0.268	0.22
%23less/entrants		0.178	0.166	0.137	0.161	0.166
%24more/entrants		0.399	0.448	0.312	0.342	0.375
%transfers 12-23 based on entrant		0.025	0.013	0.013	0.026	0.023
%transfers 24+ based on entrants		0.071	0.095	0.048	0.109	0.096
% transfers 12-23 based on credits		0.142	0.08	0.096	0.163	0.142
% transfers 24+ based on credits		0.178	0.212	0.153	0.318	0.255

DATA FROM 32 COLLEGES	BLACK	HISP	AI/IND	WHITE	TOTAL
entrants	16900	11626	615	34347	63488
credits 12-23	2993	1930	85	5518	10526
transfers 12-23	411	150	8	907	1476
credits 24	6727	5184	193	11736	23840
transfers 24	1156	1085	29	3804	6074
transfers total	1567	1235	37	4711	7550
OE	0.575	0.612	0.452	0.502	0.541
TE	0.093	0.106	0.06	0.137	0.119
TC	0.161	0.174	0.133	0.273	0.22
%23less/entrants	0.177	0.166	0.138	0.161	0.166
%24more/entrants	0.398	0.446	0.314	0.342	0.376
%transfers 12-23 based on entrant	0.024	0.013	0.013	0.026	0.023
%transfers 24+ based on entrants	0.068	0.093	0.047	0.111	0.096
% transfers 12-23 based on credits	0.137	0.078	0.094	0.164	0.14
% transfers 24+ based on credits	0.172	0.209	0.15	0.324	0.255

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONCLUSION

The Assembly's definition of transfer is based on certain logical premises.

The community college program in which the students are enrolled is not a consideration because any courses that carry college credit may also qualify for credit at the receiving institution.

The students who have dropped in only to take a course or two are not included in the calculations. Students are placed in the potential transfer category only after they have completed at least 12 credits at the community college. This leaves in the formula only those on whom the college may be expected to have had some effect; i.e., they have probably met a few instructors, seen a counselor, and participated in an orientation session or similar activity.

The transfer rate that is derived from the Assembly formula is more defensible than most of the other transfer rates that are typically calculated. It is more realistic than the retrospective view of bachelor's degree recipients because it accounts for the transfers who do not receive a higher degree. It properly includes the many students who transfer without having received an associate degree. Until the colleges collect data about all potential transfers, including those who delay transfer or who enter out-of-state institutions, the procedure will underestimate the true transfer rate, but that characterizes all formulas that

rely on incomplete student followup information.

Will the Assembly's definition be accepted? It is based on longitudinal tracking, a procedure that is unfamiliar to most community college student records systems. But collecting the data to put into the Assembly's transfer rate formula will prove no more or less difficult than supplying longitudinal information on student progress for any other purpose. It all depends on the college leaders' willingness to arrange the procedures necessary for assessing student flow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelman, C. "Transfer Rates and the Going Mythologies: A Look at Community College Patterns," Change, 1988, 20 (1), 38-41.

Berman - Weiler Associates, Increasing Transfers. Berkeley California: BW Associates, November, 1989.

California Community Colleges. Community College Transfer Performance. Sacramento: California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, Sept., 1989.

Cohen, A.M. "Counting the Transfer Students," Junior College Resource Review, Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1979, 6 pp. (ED 172 864)

Flaherty, R. "2-Year College Fail Test," Chicago Sun-Times, November 12, 13, 14, 1989.

Heinselman, J.L. Transfer Index: One Definition. Wilmington, CA: Los Angeles Harbor College, 1985. 14 pp. (ED 257 512)

Palmer, J. "Sources and Information: The Social Role of the Community College," in L.S.Zwerling (ed.) The Community College and Its Critics. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1986.

Washington State Board for Community College Education. A Study of the Role of Community Colleges in the Achievement of the Bachelor's Degree in Washington State. Report 89-1. Olympia: Washington State Board for Community College Education, 1989. 37 pp. (ED 303 199)

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
MAR 22 1990